

REMARKS

The enclosed is responsive to the Office Action mailed on July 9, 2004. Claims 1-8, 11-18 and 21-23 have been rejected. Applicants have amended claims 1, 4, 5, 12 and 21. Claims 1-23 are pending. Claims 9, 19 and 20 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants thank the Examiner for the allowability of these claims. Applicant has chosen to amend the claims in a different manner believed to make them allowable; However, Applicant will keep the indication of allowability in mind when responding to any future Office Actions.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

The Office Action rejected claims 4-8 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter to which Applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 4-5 have been amended in order to satisfy the definiteness requirement of §112, ¶2. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments do not limit the scope of the claims. Applicant therefore believes that the amended claims are in condition for allowability. Claims 6-8 are dependent upon claims 4-5 and are allowable for at least the same reason.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

The Office Action rejected claims 1-3, 12-14, 21-23 under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Granik et al., US Patent Application No. US 2002/0010757 (hereinafter “Granik”).

Granik describes an “advertisement replacement system and methodology for replacing advertising content on a web-based communications received by users.” ([0014], lines 2-4). The ad/server replaces initial content with images and “accompanying data...that constitute the necessary information to build a URL that the web user’s

browser is to be re-directed to when the images are clicked on” ([0040], lines 6-9). “Particularly, in response to a user click on a replaced ad, a web-based communication is generated that includes a redirect ad URL containing...an ultimate destination website code.” ([0043], lines 6-10). “The re-direct server 27 particularly parses the re-direct URL query string for the...ultimate destination website code and, by means of a database lookup, maps and transforms the code into a real URL to link the user to the destination website.” ([0043], lines 10-14).

Claims 1, 12 and 21

With respect to amended claims 1, 12 and 21 Applicant respectfully submits that Granik does not describe “at least one storage resource locator (“SRL”), wherein said SRL comprises a unique file identifier generated from the contents of a file to identify the file associated with said content”

Referring to the Office Action, a URL is “a link that identifies the address the file is stored at.” The URL in Granik is not an SRL because a Granik does not describe a URL including a “file identifier generated from the contents of a file.” In other words no part of the URL in Granik, including the “ultimate destination website code” (of the query string) is described as being generated from the contents of a file. Thus, Granik does not describe an SRL.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Granik does not describe what Applicants’ amended claims 1, 12 and 21 require. Claims 2-11, 13-20 and 22-23 are dependent upon claims 1, 12 and 21 respectively and are allowable for at least the same reason.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 4-7 and 15-18

The Office Action rejected claims 4-7 and 15-18 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Granik as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Schleimer et al., US Patent 6,108,655 (hereinafter “Schleimer”).

As part of Schleimer's "Method and apparatus for transmitting images and other objects over a computer network," Schleimer describes the use of URL's embedded in HTML pages.

Combination of Granik and Schleimer

The combination of Granik and Schleimer may describe the ad/replacement content of Granik on a web page having HTML components comprising an embedded URL pointed to a re-direct server and including an "ultimate destination website code".

Claims 4-7

Applicant respectively submits that claims 4-7 and 15-18 are dependent upon amended claims 1 and 12 respectively and are allowable for at least the same reason. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Granik and Schleimer does not describe what the claims require.

Claims 10 and 11

The Office Action rejected claims 10 and 11 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Granik as applied to claims 1 and further in view of Shuping et al., US Patent Application 2002/0054114 (hereinafter "Shuping").

Shuping describes a system for retrieving web pages from a server using a web browser that sends a request using a URL associated with the page. The request is passed through a network using appropriate network protocol, for example, for the Internet, a Hyper-text transfer (HTTP) protocol is used ([0034]). The requested web page is then sent back to the user computer using HTTP ([0035]).

Combination of Granik and Shuping

The combination of Granik and Shuping may describe that the "web user's browser will link directly to content located on the image/ad server" ([0038], lines 3-5), using the HTTP protocol. The combination may also describe that, "in response to a user

click on a replaced ad, a web-based communication [using HTTP protocol] is generated that includes a re-direct ad URL" ([0043], lines 6-8), and (Shuping in square brackets).

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 10 and 11 are dependent upon amended claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reason. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Granik and Shuping does not describe what the claims require.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is earnestly solicited.

Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (408) 720-8300 to help expedite any further prosecution of the present application.


Charge our Deposit Account

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Date: 6/6, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP


Daniel M. De Vos
Reg. No. 37,813

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, California 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300